



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

We promised in our last number to examine whether the Douay translators have done right in translating this word "sacrament."

First, we observe, that this Greek word, "mysterion," occurs twenty-seven times in the writings of the Apostles and Evangelists—that is, in the New Testament.*

In twenty-six of these texts, the present Douay Bible translates the word "mystery;" in one place only (that place which we are now considering, Eph. v. 32), do they translate it "sacrament."

Now, if they themselves do thus acknowledge that the word must be translated "mystery" in twenty-six places out of twenty-seven, why do they translate it "sacrament" in the twenty-seventh place? If it was the common use of the sacred writers to use that Greek word to express the meaning of "mystery," as we see that they themselves confess it was, why do not they always translate it so?

It would take some very good reason to justify translating it "sacrament," in one place, when they themselves confess that "mystery" is the right translation in twenty-six other places. Have they any good reason to give?

We expect that some learned Roman Catholic will tell us, that it was the Latin translation of the Bible, commonly called the *Vulgate*, which the Douay translators professed to translate. They will tell us that this Latin translation was established by the Council of Trent, as the authorized Bible of the Roman Catholic Church, in these words—"The Holy Synod determines and declares that this old and Vulgate edition itself, which is approved by the long use of so many ages in the Church itself, shall be held for authentic in public lectures, disputations, preachings, and expositions; and that no one shall dare or presume to reject it on any pretext whatsoever."—Session IV. They will tell us that this Latin translation, being thus the authorized and authentic Bible in their Church, it was the business of the Douay translators simply to translate this Latin Vulgate version into English, and that the proper English translation of this Vulgate edition is the true Bible in English, in the eyes of all Roman Catholics. And they will say that, since the Latin Vulgate version has the Latin word "sacramentum" in the place in question (Eph. v. 32), the proper English translation must be "sacrament."

We think we have here stated their argument as well as they would wish to state it themselves. And we now proceed to examine it, and to inquire whether they themselves think this a good and a certain rule, to translate the Greek word, "mysterion," by the word "sacrament," wherever the Latin version has translated it "sacramentum."

We have already said that the Greek word, "mysterion" occurs twenty-seven times in the Greek New Testament. Now, we find that the Vulgate, or Latin translation, translates this Greek word by the Latin word, "mysterium" in nineteen places out of the twenty-seven; and in the other eight places it translates the same Greek word by the Latin word "sacramentum," and yet, when we come to examine the present Douay Bible, we find "mystery" in twenty-seven places, and "sacrament" only in one! So we find that in seven places where the Latin Vulgate puts "sacramentum" for "mysterion," the Douay translation gives "mystery" and not "sacrament;" and how, then, can they tell us that "sacramentum" being in the Latin, is a good reason for putting "sacrament" in English?

Why did they turn the Latin word "sacramentum" into the English word "mystery" in seven places, and translate it sacrament in only one place?

We shall tell the reason of this presently; but we must tell a little more of the history of this translation first.

The first Roman Catholic translation of the New Testament into English was published in 1582. It was then called the Rhemish, simply because it was published first at Rhemes; but it is the same translation since called the Douay, as we shall hereafter show.

In that translation they followed the rule of putting the English word "mystery" whenever the Vulgate had the Latin word "mysterium," and the English word "sacrament" whenever the Latin had "sacramentum." They did this in every place but one—viz., Apoc. or Rev. xvii. 7—"I will tell them the mystery of the woman and of the beast that carrieth her." In that place the Latin vulgate has "sacramentum," but they thought it too bad to put "the sacrament of the woman," because this woman is described, in v. 6, as "drunk with the blood of the saints," and to talk of her "sacrament" would have shown at once that the Latin word "sacramentum" does not mean what we understand by the word "sacrament" now; so they put "mystery." But in the seven other places where the Latin Vulgate had the word "sacramentum" they put "sacrament" for the English. Any one may see this

* Viz., Matthew xlii. 11, Mark iv. 11, Luke viii. 10, Romans xi. 25, also in xvi. 25; 1 Cor. ii. 7, and iv. 1, xlii. 2, xiv. 2, xv. 51; Eph. i. 9, iii. 3, 4, 9, v. 32, vi. 19; Col. i. 26 and 27, ii. 1, iv. 3; 2 Thess. ii. 7; 1 Timothy iii. 9, v. 16; Apocalypse i. 20, x. 7, xvii. 5, 7. The reader will do well to examine all these places, and see whether "mystery" be not the right translation, and whether "sacrament" would make sense.

who will examine that English translation published in 1582, in the places following—viz., Eph. i. 9; iii. 3, 9; v. 32; Col. i. 27; 1 Tim. iii. 16; Apoc. i. 20; xvii. 20. In all those places that first edition, and all the Douay Bibles, we believe, for long after, had the word "sacrament" in all those places, because the Latin Vulgate had "sacramentum." Yet in every one of those places now except one (Eph. v. 32), in the present Douay Bible, this word sacrament has been put out, and the word "mystery" has been put in its place; as any one may see by looking at any of the Douay Bibles now published!

With what face, then, can they tell us that the word "sacrament" must be the proper translation in this place, because the Latin has "sacramentum," when they themselves confess that this rule led them astray in six other places, which they have felt constrained to correct by leaving out this word "sacrament," in spite of this rule? How can they tell us that our translation must be wrong, in having the word "mystery" in this place, when they themselves have felt constrained to alter their translation to "mystery" in six other places?

But why did they feel constrained to give up this rule, and alter their translation in six places out of seven? We believe it was simply because in those six places, they found it impossible to apply the word "sacramentum" in any one place, to any one of their seven sacraments! and it seemed, no doubt, dangerous to them to have the word "sacrament" six times standing for other things besides their seven sacraments, while in one place only could it be twisted to apply to one of their seven sacraments. So they altered their Bible in six places, so as to make it agree with the Protestant Bible, for fear it should be found out that the Latin word "sacramentum," in six places out of seven, meant other things besides the seven sacraments. For instance, look to Ephesians iii. 3, 4, in both verses the Greek has "mysterion;" the Latin has "sacramentum" in the 3rd verse, and "mysterium" in the 4th. The old Douay Bible had "sacrament" in the 3rd verse, and "mystery" in the 4th: but which of the seven sacraments could that be? Is it not clear that the Latin translators thought it quite indifferent whether they put the word "sacramentum" or "mysterium" for "mysterion" in the Greek? So the correctors of the Douay Bible in modern times put the word "mystery" in both verses. Again, in Ephesians i. 9, the word sacramentum was in the Latin, and sacrament in the old Douay Bible: but which of the seven sacraments could this verse mean? So it is now put out, and "mystery" put in its place.

In Colossians i. 26, 27, the Greek has "mysterion" in both verses, the Latin "mysterium" in v. 26, and "sacramentum" in v. 27. The same thing precisely occurs in 1 Timothy iii. 9, 16, and in Apocalypse or Revelation xvii. 5, 7, proving to demonstration, that the Latin translators used the word "sacramentum" merely in the sense of a mystery, and not at all in the sense of what we call a sacrament. As we have said before, the correctors of the Douay Bible have actually acknowledged this in every place but the one, by putting "mystery" in English for the Latin "sacramentum;" and with what reason can they now say that "sacramentum" must be the right translation in Ephesians v. 32, merely because the Latin is "sacramentum?"

The reason for believing that mystery is the proper translation in this place, we stated in the end of our reply to "J. B.'s" letter in our last number; we beg now to refer our readers to it again, and we venture to hope they will give it a fair consideration, now that we have shown them that, in twenty-six other places, the present Douay Bible has confessed that "mystery" is the proper translation of the same Greek word, even though "sacramentum" should be the word in the Latin, as it is in seven of those twenty-six places.

* Dr. Francis Patrick Kenrick, Roman Catholic Bishop of Philadelphia, whose recent translation of the New Testament, published in New York, in 1851, we have frequently noticed, has candidly translated the remaining passage (Ephesians v. 32), mystery, not sacrament; and states in a note, p. 395, that he has preferred the literal reading of the Greek, lest he should seem to seek support for the sacramental character of marriage in an ambiguous word.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Several valuable communications, from Mr. Power, Mr. Collette, and others, are necessarily postponed till our next, for want of room.

We have also been obliged to postpone the remainder of our reply to the letter of "J. B.," on the Disputed Sacraments, though in type, for the same reason.

We fear we have mislaid a letter of "Philalethes;" if so, another copy would oblige.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st. No anonymous letter can be attended to. Whatever is sent for insertion must be authenticated by the name and address of the writer, not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee for his good faith.

We would request our valued correspondents, both Roman Catholics and Protestants, to limit the length of their communications, and not to discuss a variety of distinct topics in one letter.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, APRIL, 1853.

SEVERAL months ago, the newspapers contained an account of a very remarkable circumstance, which was said to have taken place in the south of France, near Grenoble. The Blessed Virgin, it was stated, had appeared to two peasant children on the top of a mountain, called La Salette, and had communicated to them some mysterious revelations. The matter was much talked of, and quickly reached the ears of the Bishop of Grenoble, who examined carefully into all the circumstances of the case. The result was, that he professed himself perfectly satisfied of the truth of the miracle, and authorized the erection of a chapel on the spot where the miraculous appearance of the Virgin was said to have taken place. Numbers of pilgrims quickly flocked to this new shrine, attracted by the fame of the miracle, and deposited their gifts and offerings in the chapel of our Lady of Salette. The supernatural vision was, doubtless, often urged by the Bishop and Roman Catholic clergy as a lively and convincing proof of the lawfulness and propriety of offering up prayers to the Virgin, who had afforded such remarkable evidence of her power to hear and assist her worshippers.

But, alas! the brightest prospects will sometimes become dark and clouded; and so it was with the dawning fame of this new miraculous shrine. Cardinal de Bonald, Archbishop of Lyons, and Primate of the Gauls, was not so credulous as the Bishop of Grenoble. Whether it was that the clergy of the diocese of Lyons looked with wistful eyes at the streams of wealth which were fast pouring into the coffers of their brethren at Salette, and urged their diocesan to interfere, or whatever else the cause may have been, certain it is that a coldness sprung up between Cardinal de Bonald and the Bishop of Grenoble, which was followed by a sharp controversy as to the authenticity of the supposed miracle. At length the Cardinal issued a letter to his clergy, cautioning them against false miracles, which was published in a French periodical, called *La Semaine Religieuse*, from which the following is an extract:—

"In times of perplexity, pious, but imprudent persons are found, who wish to have it thought that God interferes in a visible manner in human affairs. An effect produced by a natural cause, which is to them a mystery, is by them transformed into a prodigy; and without waiting to examine into it, or consult men of knowledge, they allow themselves to be deceived by false appearances, and declare miracles to be true which are very questionable. Some pecuniary speculations which intrude themselves into everything, seize upon this imaginary fact, and at the expense of the credulous, turn it into profit. Men greedy of gain soon dress out the history of these false miracles, and accompany them by false indulgences. What, then, is their grand object, but to procure dishonest gains, by trafficking in objects of superstition. We, therefore, forbid the publication of any miracle from the pulpit without previous permission, should its authenticity be attested even by another bishop."

We make no apology for introducing these excellent remarks of CARDINAL DE BONALD to the notice of our readers, some of whom may be disposed to attach far greater weight to his authority than to any comment which we could offer. We have marked one or two passages in italics, as it is possible that some persons may consider them applicable in other instances nearer home. And now, we beg to call the attention of our readers to this significant illustration of the boasted unity

of the Church of Rome. We see here that two eminent Roman Catholic prelates are at open variance with regard to the truth or falsehood of a recent miracle; and the Cardinal goes so far as to assert pretty plainly, that the Bishop was issuing "false indulgences," and that "his grand object was to procure dishonest gains, by trafficking in objects of superstition." When we learn, on such unquestionable evidence, that these questionable things are done in the diocese of Grenoble, we are tempted to ask, is Ireland altogether free from the evils which Cardinal de Bonald so vividly describes? Is there among us any "trafficking in objects of superstition," whether by priests or bishops, "for the sake of procuring dishonest gains?" We sometimes hear that indulgences are issued in various dioceses in Ireland; and it is a serious subject of inquiry, are they, too, false, like those of the Bishop of Grenoble? These questions, we fear, will excite uneasy doubts in the minds of many of our readers; but we entreat of them again to remember, that we have not advanced these charges—they rest upon the grave and unimpeachable authority of CARDINAL DE BONALD.

To return, however, to the miraculous vision of the Virgin:—When we behold two Christian bishops flatly contradicting each other with regard to this event of such recent occurrence—the one asserting, the other denying, its truth—is it not a melancholy sight, and one calculated to afford a temporary, though disastrous, triumph to scoffers and unbelievers, and other enemies of our holy faith? Let us suppose that two of the early preachers of the Gospel, St. Peter and St. Paul, for example, differed in the same way about the truth of one of our Lord's miracles, what would the Jews and the heathen have said? "But," perhaps one of our Roman Catholic readers may reply, "St. Peter and St. Paul were inspired, and, therefore, there was no fear of their disagreement." Well! (it may be rejoined) what then? Does not the POPE claim to be infallible, and why does he not decide the point at issue? St. Peter, when he was alive, took special pains to assure his hearers that the miracles which he preached to them were not "cunningly devised fables" (Douay Bible, 2 Pet. i. 16); and he forewarns them that, in later times, "lying teachers should arise, who, through covetousness, should make merchandize of them with feigned words."—Ch. ii. 1, 3. When the Cardinal de Bonald testifies that these very evils now exist in the Church of Rome, why does not Pius IX., who claims to be the successor of St. Peter, lift up his voice and cry aloud, and tell the people of Grenoble, and the Christian world, whether the vision of the Virgin to the peasant children at La Salette is a miracle or a fabrication? But, alas! for all useful purposes, the chair of St. Peter has long been hopelessly silent.

THE TOUCHSTONE.

(Concluded from page 32.)

OBJECTION 48.—Protestants condemn the honour and veneration of angels.

Their Bible assures them, that God has given his angels a charge over us; and, consequently, expects, that we should honour them as his ministers and our guardians, (Ps. xci. 11, 12.) *He shall give his angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways; they shall bear thee up in their hands, lest thou dash thy foot against a stone.*—(St. Matt. xviii. 10.) *Take heed that you despise not one of these little ones: for I say unto you, that in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father that is in heaven.* (Exod. xxiii. 20, 21.)—*Behold I send an angel before thee, to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared: Beware of him, and obey his voice, provoke him not, for my name is in him.* Hence we read in their Bible, (Joshua v. 14, 15) that Joshua paid veneration to an angel, by falling on his face to the earth, &c.

REPLY.—Protestants do not say that God may not employ his angels to protect and save men; but as for worshipping them, we find it expressly forbidden.—Rev. xxii. 8, 9.

OBJECTION 49.—Protestants deny, that it is lawful to make supplication to an angel.

Their Bible assures them that Jacob did it (*Hosea xii. 4*).—*He had power over the angel, and prevailed; he wept, and made supplication to him.*

OBJECTION 50.—Protestants condemn the invocation of angels as idolatrous and superstitious.

Their Bible recommends it by the example of God's servants, both in the Old and New Testament. *Gen. xlviii. 15, 16.* *God, before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac did walk, the God which fed me all my life long until this day, the angel which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads.* And Rev. i. 4, *Grace be unto you, and peace from him, which is, and which was, and which is to come, and from the seven spirits which are before his throne.*

REPLY 49, 50.—The word angel signifies a messenger. And hence, any person or thing employed by the Lord to convey any message of his to man, is called in Scripture "the angel of the Lord." Sometimes the Lord manifested himself in a human form; sometimes in a flame of fire; as he did to Moses in the wilderness. And the voice which came there to Moses said, "I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac," &c., yet this is expressly called by Stephen "the angel."

Acts viii. 30, 38.—And whenever we read, as we do in the Old Testament, of worship offered to an angel, it was always understood to be the Lord Himself. But as for those angels who are created persons, we have seen that the worship of them is expressly forbidden.

OBJECTION 51.—Protestants deny, that the saints departed have received any power from God over us which may entitle us to have recourse to their prayers and assistance.

Their Bible teaches, that they have received this power. *Revel. ii. 26, 27.* *He that overcometh and keepeth my word unto the end (as all the saints have done) to him will I give power over the nations, and he shall rule them, even as I received of my Father.*

REPLY.—Protestants would not scruple to ask one of the Apostles to pray for them, if present before them; as Simon the sorcerer did to Peter, and was not censured for it. But to suppose that saints can, after death, hear the addresses of millions of votaries in all parts of the world, is to attribute to them the power of the all-present God. And if it had been the practice of the primitive Church to invoke departed saints, we should surely have found mention of invocations of the Apostle James, the brother of John, after his being slain by King Herod (*Acts xii. 1, 2*.) and of invocations of the Virgin, &c.

OBJECTION 52.—Protestants are not willing to own, that the angels and saints make intercession for us, or offer up our prayers to God.

Their Bible declares that they do. *Zech. i. 12.* *The angel of the Lord answered and said, O Lord of Hosts: how long wilt thou not have mercy on Jerusalem, and on the cities of Judah, against which thou hast had indignation these threescore and ten years? Rev. v. 8.* *The four and twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps and golden vials full of odours, which are the prayers of the saints.* And *Revel. viii. 4.* *The smoke of the incense with the prayers of the saints ascended up before God, out of the angel's hand.*

OBJECTION 53.—Protestants are not willing to own, that the departed saints may receive us into everlasting habitations.

Their Bible expressly affirms it. *St. Luke. xvi. 9.* *Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness, that when ye fail, they may receive you into everlasting habitations.*

REPLY 52, 53.—Protestants do not undertake to deny that angels and departed saints may make prayers for us; but for us to invoke them, implies that they can hear and know all that we say; which is in fact to make them gods. And they may welcome us into the "mansions" of bliss to which not they but Jesus Christ has "gone to prepare a place for us." But as He alone is the giver of everlasting life, and as He alone is the one "by whom we have access unto the Father," to whom "no man cometh," says He, "but through me," and it is He who we are assured can hear us, we "come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may find help in time of need."

OBJECTION 54.—Protestants deny, that the angels and saints know what passes amongst us; though they are ready enough to own that the devils know our works, and hear the petitions of their impious invokers.

Their Bible declares (*St. Luke xv. 10*) that there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth; which could not be, if they did not know what passes amongst us: and how can any one imagine that they who see God face to face, and know even as they are known (1 Cor. xiii. 12) that they, I say, who enjoy the Light of Glory, can be more ignorant of what passes amongst us than the devils, who have no more than the light of nature?

REPLY.—For aught we can tell, everything that passes on earth may be known to some angel or other, who may be invisibly present, looking on at the occurrence. But we have no example in Scripture of any one paying adoration to an angel (except when it was a manifestation of the Lord himself) without being immediately rebuked and forbidden. As to saints, there is no

reason for believing that they can be present here as well as in heaven.

OBJECTION 55.—Protestants generally are not willing to acknowledge that there is any particular respect due to the blessed Virgin Mary; or that she is any more than any other woman.

Their Bible plainly signifies that there is: in which she is declared by the angel Gabriel, and by Elizabeth, inspired by the Holy Ghost, blessed among women (*St. Luke i. 28* and *42*) and that all generations shall call her blessed, ver. 48. And whence is this to me, says the same St. Elizabeth (ver. 43) that the mother of my Lord shall come to me?

REPLY.—Protestants acknowledge that the Virgin Mary was "blessed among women;" but they hold that God only is to be worshipped and prayed to. And they find no mention of adoration paid to her in the New Testament.

OBJECTION 56.—Protestants believe that it is a dishonour to God, and reflecting upon his mercy, to have recourse to the prayers of his saints.

Their Bible demonstrates, that God is pleased that we should have recourse to their prayers, and will more readily hear them, than if we were only to pray for ourselves. *Go to my servant Job, says God Almighty (Job xlii. 8) to Eliphaz and his friends; and my servant Job shall pray for you, for him will I accept: lest I deal with you after your folly, in that ye have not spoken of me the thing that is right, &c.*

REPLY.—If God had told any persons, instead of going to Job, and asking his prayers, while he was alive, to address him when he was, perhaps, a thousand miles off, or after he was dead, this would give some countenance to the practice of calling on departed saints. And we should thence have inferred that Job must have been a Divine being; but, as it is, the passage is nothing to the purpose. A Protestant would not scruple to ask a friend, whom he believed to be a sincere and pious Christian, to pray for him; though, after all, none but the all-seeing God can be sure of any one's piety and sincerity, unless he has, as Job's friends had in this case, God's own assurance of it.

OBJECTION 57.—Protestants deny, that God is pleased to work miracles by the bones or other relics of his saints.

The contrary appears from their Bible, where we read, (*2 Kings xiii. 21*), of a dead man raised to life by the bones of the prophet Elisha; and (*Acts xix. 12*), that from the body of Paul were brought unto the sick handkerchiefs or aprons, and the diseases departed from them, and the evil spirits went out of them.

REPLY.—Protestants never deny that God has, on many occasions, wrought miracles in various ways; but they refuse to believe any accounts of miracles that are not well attested.

OBJECTION 58.—Many Protestants deny, that it is lawful to have images in churches.

Their Bible expressly declares, that God commanded Moses to make two cherubims, or images of angels, and to place them at the two ends of the mercy-seat, over the ark of the covenant, in the very sanctuary itself, or the holy of holies—(*Exod. xxv. 18, 19, 20, 21*.) And there, says he, (ver. 22), *will I meet with thee, and I will commune with thee from above the mercy-seat, from between the two cherubims, which are upon the ark of the testimony, of all things which I will give thee in commandment unto the children of Israel.*

REPLY.—Protestants do not object to images or pictures, in churches or elsewhere, provided they can be sure that no kind of adoration is paid to them, whether called Latria, Dulia, or Hyperdulia. The distinctions between these they hold to be not only unwarranted, but also such as the generality of the unlearned among the Roman Catholics themselves do not understand. Who will maintain that they do? And yet Roman Catholic divines hold that understanding, and attending to these distinctions, is essential for the avoiding of idolatry. Hence, when Protestants perceive any danger of any kind of adoration being paid to any image, they think it right to deal with it as Hezekiah did with the brazen serpent which Moses himself had made by divine command. He does not appear to have inquired whether they burned incense before it with Latria or Dulia, or Hyperdulia; but he at once brake it in pieces. As for the cherubim there was no such danger from them, because they were kept in the holy of holies, to which none of the people had access.

OBJECTION 59.—Protestants deny the supremacy of St. Peter; that is, they deny that he was made by Christ the rock or foundation; or the chief Governor, and chief Pastor of his church.

Their Bible affirms it, (*Matt. xvi. 18, 19*), *Thou art Peter [that is, thou art a rock] and upon this rock will I build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.* Where our Lord, under the metaphor of the keys, declares his making Peter the chief governor of his church; as when the keys of a city are delivered to a man, he is made ruler or governor of the city. And that St. Peter was made chief pastor or shepherd of the whole flock of